

302

may affect the deliberations of this committee. Fifty-six percent of those polled regarded cigarettes as a definite health hazard, while an additional 40 percent thought they might be, and only 4 percent thought cigarettes were not a health hazard. Fifty-four percent were of the opinion that cigarette advertising should be restricted by legislation, while 27 percent approved current advertising policies, and 21 percent were unconcerned. Ninety-eight percent were convinced that children should be advised about the hazards of smoking, and that the instructions should come from both the parents and school teachers. Of those who smoked, in the survey, 68 percent indicated that they would like to stop.

Since the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health in 1964, there have been published over 2,000 research studies, all of which confirm and strengthen the findings of the Surgeon General. Now, even more than in 1964, there is a need for appropriate remedial action.

There is good evidence that the hazard is related to tar yield, and cigarettes can be made less hazardous and in a way that is acceptable to that portion of the public who are unable to stop smoking. Legislation that would progressively reduce the amount of tar yield in cigarettes is desirable. Other remedial action would include making Federal funds available to foster and support health education programs in schools throughout the Nation. However, in this matter of education, success is not likely to be realized in the presence of unrelenting and overwhelming amounts of cigarette advertising. Advertising which promotes a dubious theme that all that is beautiful and pleasurable in life is associated with cigarette smoking.

There are before you a number of proposals (H.R. 6621, H.R. 6543, H.R. 6544, and H.R. 6545), all of which are written in the same verbal tone. They describe themselves as bills "to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking," while at the same time the content of the bills specifically preempts anyone of the right of using the best and most effective means of providing health protection for the public.

Further, it is interesting that the same bills single out tobacco as a product for which the Federal Trade Commission must recognize limitations in the exercise of its regulatory powers. An increasingly informed and concerned public is beginning to ask more questions about the privileged sanctuary and, apparently, untouchable status of tobacco.

Tobacco is, after all, a substance whose combustion byproducts are assimilated by the body. These products number in the hundreds, are pharmacologically active, and many are regarded as being harmful. Rarely is cigarette smoke described as beneficial to body function. Many other products with properties far less suspect have either been removed from the market or required to label in detail all possible undesirable effects and rigidly follow closely regulated advertising policies. It would seem, to date, that tobacco has been able to classify itself in a category that is unique and quite invulnerable to acceptable standards of governmental scrutiny and regulation.

Past experience has shown that had cigarettes been made of cranberries, for example, effective action would come with a far less strain

Is it unreasonable to expect a product that does now, and with hundreds of thousands of people, possible undesirable effects caused by an industry really free of all restrictions they incur? Are they to be allowed to produce on public airways with increasing amount of public censure? For the above reasons, I urge action which will:

- cause that a realistic statement of the nicotine content of each cigarette be an integral part of all cigarette advertising
- progressively and effectively reduce the tar yield in cigarettes

- provide funds for effective health education
- remove from radio and television advertising

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KYROS. Thank you, Dr. Vincent.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Dr. Vincent, the Roswell Park Memorial Institute is engaged in research on cancer?

Dr. VINCENT. It concerns itself with research and clinical aspects.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Has it been recent in this area?

Dr. VINCENT. In detail I cannot be familiar with the financial structure of both Federal and State and private groups.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. The reason for the reading hearings of the Appropriations Committee, you received almost \$4.5 million in the last year.

Mr. VINCENT. I am delighted to see that you are interested in this area and is spending large amounts of money to get at answers. I only have one question.

On the second page of your statement, you mention Mr. D. A. Coulson, "a representative of the cigarette industry."

I wonder if you could identify him specifically?

Dr. VINCENT. Yes, I am quoting from July 23. It is from the editorial, Mr. Coulson, of this editorial:

"In the belief that profits—"

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Who is Mr. Coulson?

Dr. VINCENT. I am getting to it right now. He is an employee of the American Leaf Organization of the largest purchaser of U.S. export tobacco.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. He is an employee of the American Leaf Organization?

Dr. VINCENT. Yes, sir.

1005072765

of this committee. Fifty-six percent of them as a definite health hazard, while another 14 percent they might be, and only 4 percent health hazard. Fifty-four percent were advertising should be restricted by legislation current advertising policies, and 24 percent were convinced that the hazards of smoking, and that both the parents and school teachers. In a survey, 68 percent indicated that they

General's Advisory Committee on tobacco have been published over 2,000 times to confirm and strengthen the findings of the survey, there is a need for

hazard is related to tar yield, and is dangerous and in a way that is acceptable who are unable to stop smoking. Legislation to reduce the amount of tar yield in cigarettes is a logical action would include making posters and succor health education throughout the Nation. However, in this matter of tar yield to be realized in the presence of numerous products of cigarette advertising. Advertisements theme that all that is beautiful and good with cigarette smoking.

of proposals (H.R. 6621, H.R. 6545, H.R. 6546) which are written in the same verbal form as bills "to extend public health protection from smoking," while at the same time the proposals exempt anyone of the right of using any of providing health protection for

the same bills single out tobacco as a Tobacco Commission must recognize limitations of regulatory powers. An increasingly vocal public is beginning to ask more questions and, apparently, untouchable status of

whose combustion byproducts are products number in the hundreds, are many are regarded as being harmful. Cigarettes are regarded as beneficial to body function. Cigarettes far less suspect have either been required to label in detail all possible ingredients. Cigarettes follow closely regulated advertising. Cigarettes tobacco has been able to classify cigarettes as quite invulnerable to acceptable regulation and regulation.

had cigarettes been made of cranberry would come with a far less strain.

Is it unreasonable to expect that an industry which manufactures a product that does now, and will yet, adversely affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, state clearly on their packaging the possible undesirable effects caused by the use of their product? Is such an industry really free of all responsibility and liability for the harm they incur? Are they to be allowed the unlimited promotion of this product on public airways with advertising that is receiving an increasing amount of public censure?

For the above reasons, I urgently request you to support legislation which will:

—cause that a realistic statement of hazard, as well as the tar and nicotine content of each cigarette be printed on each pack and be an integral part of all cigarette advertising;

—progressively and effectively reduce the tar and nicotine yield per cigarette;

—provide funds for effective health education in schools; and

—remove from radio and television, all cigarette advertising.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KYROS. Thank you, Dr. Vincent.

Mr. Satterfield?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Vincent, the Roswell Park Memorial Institute; is this primarily engaged in research on cancer?

Dr. VINCENT. It concerns itself primarily with cancer on both the research and clinical aspects.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Has it been receiving Federal grants for research in this area?

Dr. VINCENT. In detail I cannot tell you, Mr. Satterfield. I am not familiar with the financial structure other than to know that we receive both Federal and State and private grants.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. The reason for bringing this up is that I notice in reading hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee that in 1967 you received almost \$4.5 million in this area, and I just wanted to comment that I am delighted to see that the Federal Government is interested in this area and is spending large sums of money on research to try to get at answers. I only have one question of you, sir, really.

On the second page of your statement you refer to and quote a statement by Mr. D. A. Coulson, "a respected authority in the tobacco industry."

I wonder if you could identify this gentleman a little bit more specifically?

Dr. VINCENT. Yes, I am quoting now from the Tobacco Magazine of July 23. It is from the editorial. Mr. Coulson is described by the author of this editorial:

"In the belief that profits—"

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Who is Mr. Coulson, that is what I am trying to find out.

Dr. VINCENT. I am getting to it right now. He is on the research staff of the American Leaf Organization of the Imperial Tobacco Co. They are the largest purchaser of U.S. exports flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. He is an employee of that company, is that correct?

Dr. VINCENT. Yes, sir.

1005072766